



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,021	11/12/2003	Arnaud Fausse	09669/009/002	6206
7590 06/26/2008 ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P. Suite 2800 1221 McKinney Street Houston, TX 77010				
EXAMINER				
REZA, MOHAMMAD W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2136				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/26/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/706,021

**Applicant(s)**

FAUSSE, ARNAUD

**Examiner**

MOHAMMAD W. REZA

**Art Unit**

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-16 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-16 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/12/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the arguments filed on 03/07/2008.
2. Claims 7-16 are pending in the application.
3. Claims 7-16 have been rejected.

***Response to Amendment***

4. The examiner approves the amendments made to claims 7-16.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michel Farges hereafter Farges (US patent 6125405) in view of Mooney et al hereafter Mooney (US Patent 5515440).
7. As per claim 7, Farges discloses an authentication device comprising a message storage device, a protected device connected to said storage device, a display device connected to said protected device, characterized in that the protected device is provided with inputs/outputs I1/O1 of commands/data for the link with said storage device and I2/O2 of display for the link with said display device, physically separate (col.

3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49). Though, Frages mentions a microprocessor, he does not expressly disclose the device is constituted by a microprocessor card. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mooney discloses the device is constituted by a microprocessor card (col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-9). Accordingly, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the network security art at the time of invention was made to have incorporated Mooney's teachings of method device with microprocessor card with the teachings of Farges, for the purpose of suitably using the protected device incorporated with storage and display device with separate input/output (col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-9).

8. As per claim 8, Farges discloses the authentication device characterized in that the only logic link between the commands/data circulating between said protected device and said storage device on one hand and data circulating between said protected device and said display device on the other hand, is the software of said protected device (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49).

9. As per claim 9, Farges discloses the authentication device characterized in that said display device is a printer, a screen, or a filing device (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49).

10. As per claim 10, Farges discloses a device able to be connected to a message storage device and to a display device, characterized in that it is provided with inputs/outputs I1/O1 of commands/data for the link with said storage device and I2/O2 of display for the link with said display device, physically separate. (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49). Though, Frages mentions device with a

microprocessor, he does not expressly disclose the device is constituted by a microprocessor card. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mooney discloses the device is constituted by a microprocessor card (col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-9). The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 10.

11. As per claim 11, Farges discloses the microprocessor card characterized in that the only logic link between the commands/data circulating between said microprocessor card and said storage device on one hand and data circulating between said microprocessor card and said display device on the other hand, is the software of said card (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49).

12. As per claim 12, Farges discloses the microprocessor card characterized in that it comprises a physically separate inlet to enter a confidential code (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49).

13. As per claim 13, Farges discloses a box able to receive a protected device and able to be connected to a message storage device and to a display device, characterized in that it comprises a data/command circuit for the link with said storage device and a display circuit for the link with said display device, the inlets/outlets of said data/command circuit and said display circuit being electrically independent (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49). Though, Farges mentions the microprocessor, he does not expressly disclose the box is constituted by a microprocessor card. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mooney discloses the box is constituted by a microprocessor card (col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-9).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 13.

14. As per claim 14, Farges discloses the box characterized in that the only logic link between the data circulating in the data/commands and display circuits is the software of said protected device (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49).

15. As per claim 15, Farges discloses the box characterized in that it comprises a keyboard allowing to enter data, such as a confidential code (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49).

16. As per claim 16, Farges discloses an authentication device of a message, comprising an-storage device, a protected device connected to said storage device, a display device connected to said protected device to form a secure environment, wherein the protected device configured to form a bridge between the storage device and the display device, and wherein the storage device is an uncertain zone and the display device is a certain zone (col. 3, lines 35-55, col. 4, lines 16-40, col. 1, lines 43-49). Though, Farges mentions the microprocessor, he does not expressly discloses the box is constituted by a microprocessor card. However, in the same field of endeavor, Mooney discloses the the box is constituted by a microprocessor card (col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 1-9).

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 7 applies equally as well to claim 16.

## **Conclusion**

Art Unit: 2136

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad w. Reza whose telephone number is 571-272-6590. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MOAZZAMI NASSER G can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Mohammad Wasim Reza

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136

AU 2136